

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 26, 2004, claims 1-39 were rejected. Claims 1-39 are now pending in the application. In view of the remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

Examiner objected to Claims 25 and 36 based on their respective dependencies. Claims 25 and 36 are amended to correct this typographical error.

Claims 1-7, 9, 20-22, and 24-31 were rejected under U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,230,172 (hereinafter Purnaveja). Applicant respectfully disagrees based on the amendments and remarks below.

Applicant amends Claims 1, 9, 21, and 30 to include the limitation of:

wherein said data mark indicates a time and said data
mark represents content that is broadcasted at said
time

Purnaveja teaches the use synchronization scripts and associated multimedia streams for servers and client computers. Further, Purnaveja teaches annotated multimedia streams that include a compressed video stream for display in a video window, an accompanying compressed audio stream and annotations.

(Abstract)

Applicant submits that Purnaveja fails to teach said data mark of the present application where the said data mark indicates a time. Applicant further submits that Purnaveja fails to teach said data mark that represent content that is broadcasted at said time.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 9, 21, and 30 are in condition for allowance. In addition, Claims 2-7 depend directly or indirectly on Claim 1 and therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Claim 20 depends directly or indirectly on Claim 9 and therefore, is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Claims 22, and 24-29 depend directly or indirectly on Claim 21 and therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Claim 31 depends directly or indirectly on Claim 1 and therefore, is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 8, 10, and 30-39 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purnaveja in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,352 (hereinafter Moezzi). Claim 8 depends directly or indirectly on Claim 1, and Claim 1 is allowable for the same reasons as stated above. Claim 10 depends directly or indirectly on Claim 9, and Claim 9 is allowable for the same reasons as stated above. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 10 are also in a condition for allowance.

Applicant submits that Purnaveja and Moezzi fail to teach said data mark of the present application where the said data mark indicates a time. Applicant further submits that Purnaveja and Moezzi fail to teach said data mark that represent content that is broadcasted at said time. Therefore, independent Claim 30 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purnaveja in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,589,849 (hereinafter Ditzik). Claim 18 depends directly or indirectly on Claim 9, and Claim 9 is allowable for the same reasons as stated above. Accordingly, Claim 18 is also in a condition for allowance.

Claim 19 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purnaveja in view of Ditzik and further in view of Moezzi. Claim 19 depends

directly or indirectly on Claim 9, and Claim 9 is allowable for the same reasons as stated above. Accordingly, Claim 19 is also in a condition for allowance.


Claim 20 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purnaveja in view of Ditzik and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,326 (hereinafter Gupta.) Claim 20 depends directly or indirectly on Claim 9, and Claim 9 is allowable for the same reasons as stated above. Accordingly, Claim 20 is also in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Richard H. Butler at (408) 223-9763.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/8/04



Richard H. Butler
Registration No. 40,932

Please Send Correspondence to:
Valley Oak Law
5655 Silver Creek Valley Road
#106
San Jose, CA 95138
(408)223-9763